

Claims:

1. A method for determining the correct escheat jurisdiction for abandoned property, said method comprising:
  - interrogating a data file of property owner addresses;
  - comparing the addresses to certified data base addresses certified to be in existence; and
  - assigning a probable escheat jurisdiction based on the comparison.
2. The method according to claim 1, further comprising:
  - assigning a confidence code to the escheat jurisdiction determination.
3. The method according to claim 1, further comprising:
  - making corrections to property owner addresses based on the comparison.
4. The method according to claim 1, further comprising:
  - filtering non-address information from the property owner data base prior to said step of comparing.
5. The method according to claim 4, wherein:
  - the non-address information includes legal designations of the type of property ownership.
6. The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

assigning an alternate escheat jurisdiction based on the comparison.

7. The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

comparing the name and address data to a list selected from the group consisting of foreign countries, terrorists, international narcotics traffickers, and those engaged in activities related to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; and

flagging the accounts which include data that match the list.

8. The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

comparing the addresses to a list of location designations.

9. The method according to claim 3, further comprising:

indicating which addresses were corrected.

10. The method according to claim 9, further comprising:

indicating the type of correction made.

11. The method according to claim 1, wherein:

said step of comparing includes comparing data found in city, state/province, and zip/postal code fields.

12. The method according to claim 11, further comprising:

correcting the property owner address zip/postal code when city, state/province, and additional address components are correct as per USPS or foreign postal guidelines, but the zip/postal code is incorrect by the comparison.

13. The method according to claim 11, further comprising:

correcting the property owner address state when the city, zip/postal code, and additional address components are correct as per USPS or foreign postal guidelines, but the state is incorrect by the comparison.

14. The method according to claim 11, further comprising:

correcting the property owner address state when the zip/postal code is missing or incorrect and the state/province is missing and the city name exists in more than one state/province, said step of appending the property owner address state/province based on a statistical analysis of the number of zip/postal codes for the city in each state/province having the city.

15. The method according to claim 14, wherein:

the statistical analysis includes comparison to a user selected high threshold.

16. The method according to claim 15, wherein:

the statistical analysis includes comparison to a user selected low threshold.

17. The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

prior to said step of comparing, filtering the property owner addresses based on user supplied suppression data.

18. The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

indicating how the probable escheat jurisdiction was assigned.

19. The method according to claim 2, further comprising:

generating a report that defines the composition of the abandoned property database and summarizes metrics by the confidence code.

20. The method according to claim 1, wherein:

said method is performed with a computer coupled to the Internet.